

replacement section clarifies and defines the terms "MAND" and "MAJ".

Claims 6-7, 10-11 were objected to because of the following informalities: the terms "MAND" and "MAJ" should be spelled out. It is respectfully pointed out that the terms "MAND" and "MAJ" are combinatorial logic terms, now clarified and defined in the aforementioned replacement specification section.

Claims 13-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The independent claim 13 is amended herein to more distinctly claim the relevant subject matter.

Claims 1,2,6,7, and 13, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Subramanian (U.S. 5,361,276) in view of Burns (U.S. 6,611,512). First, the applicant respectfully points out that nowhere does Subramanian or Burns disclose or suggest that any PN codes are prime or relatively prime. Indeed, nowhere is the word "prime" even used in Subramanian or Burns. Claim 1 of the present application clearly recites the novel feature of "wherein the at least three PN component codes are relatively prime". Second, the applicant, in accordance with paragraph 8 of the subject office action, amended claim 1 to incorporate claim 3 allowable subject matter. In light of the above, the applicant respectfully asserts that amended claim 1, and all its progeny are now in a condition for allowance.

Claims 3,4,5, and 8-12 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. As pointed out above, claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 3. Likewise, claim 8 has also been amended to more clearly claim features of the present invention. Thus, in light of the above, the applicant respectfully asserts that amended claim 8 and its progeny are now in a condition for allowance.

Similarly, claims 16-21 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C., 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 16 is cancelled herein, without prejudice, and its features incorporated into its base claim 13. Thus, in light of the above, the applicant respectfully asserts that amended claim 13 and its progeny are now in a condition for allowance.

Finally, claims 1,2,8,9,13,14,15,22, and 23 were provisionally rejected on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 2,3,12,20,27,28,29, and 30, of co-pending application 10/242,146 (amendment filed 11/13/2006). The applicant respectfully asserts that this issue is now moot in light of the amended claims herein. Also, if the issue is not moot, it is not clear why claims 8, and 9 in paragraph 7 of the present office action are rejected on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness type double patenting, when in paragraph 8 of the present application claims 8-12 are only objected to. Thus, if the issue is not moot, the Examiner is respectfully requested to clarify.

Filed concurrently within PAIR is the fee for a petition for a one month extension of time.

Should any unresolved issue remain, the Examiner is invited to call Applicant's Attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Kevin P. Correll/

4/15/07

---

Kevin P. Correll (Reg. No. 46,641)

---

Date

K. P. Correll & Associates, LLP

270 Bellevue Ave, #326

Newport, RI 02840

V: (401) 295-7377

F: (401) 295-9054